

are the terms of the entrustment and (2) will a copy of this *kychit* be kindly placed on the Table of the House?

Mr. K. Govinda Menon.—The name of the person is കൊട്ടക്കുഴി എത്തപ്പാണെന്നല്ല കഞ്ഞിപ്പെലോതം.

A copy of the *kychit* executed by him containing the terms of entrustment is placed on the Council Table.

Mr. Syed Mohamed Rowther, forest contractor.

30. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Will the Government be pleased to state what all contract were entered into with Mr. Syed Mohamed Rowther of Palghat by the Forest Department;

and (2) whether he has settled all his accounts and paid the amount?

Mr. K. Govinda Menon.—The contracts entered into were for the purchase of

(a) D₄ and D₉ coupes teak topplings.

(b) 300 candies of rose-wood.

(2) Yes; except a sum of Rs. 127 in the shape of interest under the rose-wood contract.

Chittur Kanom lands.

31. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Will the Government be pleased to state the names of purchasers of Chittur Kanom lands after disafforestation, the extent of the area purchased by each and the amount realised from each of them?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—The disafforestation of Chittur Kanom lands, for the first time, took place in the year 1087. The lands were assigned by (1) public auction and (2) on individual applications. To gather the particulars now required is a laborious task involving an examination of the accounts from the year 1087 which the Government do not think it worthwhile to undertake.

Agreement with Mr. P. T. Lazar.

32. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Will the Government be pleased to place on the Table of the House a copy of the agreement of Mr. P. T. Lazar's White Cedar contract with the Forest Department?

Mr. K. Govinda Menon.—A copy of the agreement asked for is placed on the Council Table.

Area of cattle grazing grounds.

33. Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) the total area of lands set apart for grazing in each of the Taluks;

(b) the approximate number of cattle existing in each of the Taluks?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—(a) A statement showing the total area of lands set apart for the grazing in each of the Taluks is placed on the Council Table.

(b) A list containing the required information is laid on the Council Table.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Is the whole acreage mentioned here fit for grazing?

Mr. A. K. Vengu Ayyar.—I want notice.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—In the Cranganur Taluk, there is no grazing ground. I want to know how the cattle in Cranganur manage to get on.

Mr. A. K. Vengu Ayyar.—There was no grazing ground set apart at the time of Settlement.

President.—They must somehow or other manage without resorting to grazing grounds.

Mr. A. K. Vengu Ayyar.—In the Settlement, no grazing-ground was set apart.

President.—It may possibly be that there was no suitable grazing ground.

Mr. A. K. Vengu Ayyar.—Yes. All of them were occupied lands. Even *porambokes* were occupied.

Certain publications regarding the election at Kunnankulam.

34. **Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.**—Will the Government be pleased to state what action has been taken in the matter referred to in question No. 80 of the Budget Session of 1903, by the District Magistrate?

Mr. A. K. Vengu Ayyar.—The District Magistrate sent the records to the Kunnankulam Sub-Inspector for investigation and necessary action. Government have, however, since ordered that no prosecution is necessary.

Appointment of a peon in the Anchal Department.

35. **Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.**—Will the Government be pleased to peruse the article “*ചെറിയ മതേന്ദ്രപ്രഭാസം*” in the “*മതേന്ദ്ര*” newspaper of 3rd Chingam 1904 and state if the allegations in para 2 of that article are true; if so, what are the superior qualifications of the servant of the Superintendent for the appointment?

Mr. A. K. Vengu Ayyar.—It is true that the Mail Peon of the Trichur Anchal Office applied for a month's privilege leave in Karkadagam 1903, and the Anchalmaster recommended a brother of the peon to act for him. The recommendation could not be accepted, as it was against departmental Circular No. 5 of 1902, the nominee being a relative of the Mail Peon. The man appointed was not in any way disqualified for the post.